



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,271	04/18/2001	Susumu Honma	109295	5481
25944	7590	08/07/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/836,271

Applicant(s)

HONMA ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T. Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 6 and 11 in the amendment filed on 6/23/2006. Claims 1-19, 21-22 are pending in this Office action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 and 21-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that Omniform does not teach the claimed limitation "which is defined based on the portion of the data included in the extracted table by the database defining means, as an attribute of a cell of the table included in the generated database-related data input form".

In response to applicant argument, a new ground(s) of rejection is discussed in this office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over the Omniform User's Manual in view of Special Edition Using Access 97 (hereinafter "Access") and Bowker et al (or hereinafter "Bowker") (US 6601071).

As to claims 1, 6 and 11, Omniform teaches a data input form generation system comprising:

data input form acceptance means for accepting input of a data input form including a table (Chapter 1, page 4, lines 3-5);

table extraction means for identifying the table and extracting the table and data included in the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means (Chapter 7, page 2, lines 1-5);

database defining means for defining a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction means (Chapter 6, page 7, lines 8-10; Chapter 7, page 2, lines 1-5);

data input form generating means for generating a database-related data input form related with the defined database by setting field information corresponding to the database (chapter 6, page 2, lines 6-9).

Omniform does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "by using a portion of the data included in the extracted table as a field name of the database; which is defined based on the portion of the data included in the extracted table by the database defining means, as an attribute of a cell of the table included in the generated database-related data input form".

Access teaches that it is possible to use a portion of data included in the table extracted from a hypertext file as a field name of the database, and that inputted data can be inputted to each corresponding field of the database and the table included in the generated database- related data input form is based on the extracted table (page 2, lines 1-2 and Figure 17.31 ).

Bowker teaches creating a XML file including fields corresponding to fields of the database. The XML file is represented as the generated database-related data input form (col. 7, lines 60-67; col. 8, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Access's teaching of use a portion of data included in the table extracted from a hypertext file as a field name of the database, inputting data to each corresponding field of the database and the table included in the generated database- related data input form is based on the extracted table and Bowker's teaching creating a XML file including fields corresponding to fields of the database. to Omniform's system in order to reduce a large amount of unwanted data to be transfer to users and further to allow a user to select a portion of an database formatted in a description language on a web page.

As to Claims 2, 7, and 12, Omniform discloses the portion of data is data included in a first-row cell of the table extracted by the table extraction means (Chapter 6, page 7, lines 8-10).

As to Claims 3, 8 and 13, Omniform and Access disclose the limitations as discussed in Claims 1; 6 and 11 above. Omniform further discloses the portion of data is data included in a first-column cell of the table extracted by the table extraction means (Omniform: Chapter 6, page 7, lines 8-10; Chapter 5, page 43, lines 16-20; Access: Chapter 17, page 2, lines 1-2, and Figure 17.31).

As to Claims 4, 9 and 14, Omniform discloses the data input form acceptance means accepts input of the data input form configured as electronic document data (Chapter 4, page 6, lines 1 -1 0).

As to Claims 5, 10, and 15, Omniform discloses the data input form acceptance means accepts input of the data input form recorded onto a recording sheet (Chapter 1, page 3, lines 1-3).

As to Claims 16, 17 and 18: Omniform and Access disclose the limitations as discussed in Claims 1, 6 and 11 above. Access further discloses wherein the data input form also includes at least one character string that is not part of the extracted table - specifically, the HTML tags which are inherent to the data input forms being imported into the Access software (Access: page 2, Figure 1 ', also see Chapter 17, page 5, Figure 1).

As to Claims 21 and 22, Omniform and Access disclose the limitations as discussed in claims 16 and 17 above. Access further discloses wherein the generated database-related data input form includes at least a portion of the at least one character string that is not part of the extracted table (Access, Chapter 17 - reference included in this Action).

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Call (US 6154738) in view of the Omniform and Chang et al (or hereinafter "Chang") (US 6061515).

As to claims 1, 6 and 11, Call teaches a data input form generation system comprising:

data input form acceptance means for accepting input of a data input form including a table (fig. 2, col. 5, lines 60-67; col. 6, lines 1-15);

table extraction means for identifying the table and extracting data included in the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means by using a portion of the data included in the extracted table as a field name of the database (col. 6, lines 54-67);

database defining means for defining a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction means (col. 6, lines 54-67).

Call does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "extracting the table; data input form generating means for generating a database-related data input form related with the defined database by setting field information corresponding to the database, which is defined based on the portion of the data included in the extracted table by the database defining means, as an attribute of a cell of the table included in the generated database-related data input form".

Omniform teaches extracting the table (Chapter 7, page 2, lines 1-5).

Chang teaches to represent tuples in an object schema, each data type in the relational schema must map to an equivalent data type in the object schema. In

Art Unit: 2162

addition to mapping table columns to class attributes, the Schema Mapper also maps the table data types to attributes data types. The object schema is represented as a database-related data input form (col. 14, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Omniform's teaching of extracting the table and Chang's teaching of to represent tuples in an object schema, each data type in the relational schema must map to an equivalent data type in the object schema. In addition to mapping table columns to class attributes, the Schema Mapper also maps the table data types to attributes data types to call's system in order to reduce a large of amount unwanted data to be transfer to users and further to allow a user to select a portion of a database formatted in a description language on a web page.

As to Claims 2, 7, and 12, Call, Change, and Omniform disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, 6 and 11, Omniform further discloses the portion of data is data included in a first-row cell of the table extracted by the table extraction means (Chapter 6, page 7, lines 8-10).

As to Claims 3, 8 and 13, Call, Change, and Omniform disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, 6 and 11, Omniform further discloses the portion of data is data included in a first-column cell of the table extracted by the table extraction means (Omniform: Chapter 6, page 7, lines 8-10; Chapter 5, page 43, lines 16-20).

As to Claims 4, 9 and 14, Call, Change, and Omniform disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, 6 and 11, Omniform further discloses the data input form acceptance means accepts input of the data input form configured as electronic document data (Chapter 4, page 6, lines 1 -1 0).

As to Claims 5, 10, and 15, Call, Change, and Omniform disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, 6 and 11, Omniform further discloses the data input form acceptance means accepts input of the data input form recorded onto a recording sheet (Chapter 1, page 3, lines 1-3).

6. Claims 16-18, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Call in view of Change and the Omniform User's Manual and further in view of Special Edition Using Access 97 (hereinafter "Access").

As to Claims 16, 17 and 18, Call does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein the data input form also includes at least one character string that is not part of the extracted table. Access teaches specifically, the HTML tags, which are inherent to the data, input forms being imported into the Access software (Access: page 2, Figure 1 also see Chapter 17, page 5, Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Access's teaching of specifically, the HTML tags which are inherent to the data input forms being imported into the Access software to Call's system in order to it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2162

time the invention was made to modify Call's system to use a portion of the data as the field names (headers) for the database and to input subsequent data in the corresponding fields in the database. The motivation for this would be to improve the user experience by automating a task that simplifies future searches of the data.

As to Claims 21 and 22, As to Claims 16, 17 and 18, Call does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein the generated database-related data input form includes at least a portion of the at least one character string that is not part of the extracted table. Access teaches string that is not part of the extracted table (Access, Chapter 17 - reference included in this Action).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Access's teaching of specifically, the HTML tags which are inherent to the data input forms being imported into the Access software to Call's system in order to it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Call's system to use a portion of the data as the field names (headers) for the database and to input subsequent data in the corresponding fields in the database. The motivation for this would be to improve the user experience by automating a task that simplifies future searches of the data.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

De Hilster et al (US 2002/0065830)

Wotring et al (US 6853997)


Wheeler et al (US 6839714).

### Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Cam Y Truong  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
8/1/2006